

Decisions Regarding Fame of Intel Corporation's Marks

Country	Bulgaria
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Intellect (INTEL, Reg. No. 17220 and service mark INTEL Service Mark No. 767)
Proceeding	Cancellation
Application Filing Date	November 13, 1990
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL for microprocessors
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	June 28, 2000
Summary of Decision	The Bulgarian Trademark Office issued a decision dated June 28, 2000 finding that "the world renown of the mark INTEL of Intel Corporation may not be subject of any doubt." The decision also qualifies the mark INTEL as a mark, which is "popular in the country as a world renowned mark." Based upon these and other findings, the Bulgarian Trademark Office cancelled registration for trademark INTEL (Trademark No. 17 220) in Classes 1, 6, 7, 8, 11, 21, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34 and service mark INTEL (Service Mark No. 767) in Classes 35-42.

Country	Chile
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Intel Net S.A. (INTEL NET, Reg. No. 457.433)
Proceeding	Cancellation
Application Filing Date	February 15, 1996
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL in the field of computation and multimedia Communications
Status of Proceeding	Pending
Date Closed	
Summary of Decision	Department of Industrial Property of Chile found that the Intel mark is famous and renowned in the field of computation and multimedia communications.

Country	China
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Xinhongyao Science and Technology Development Corp. (WINTEL, App. No. 1078501)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	June 17, 1996
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL for computer products
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	June 10, 1999
Summary of Decision	The Trademark Office of The State Administration for Industry and Commerce issued a decision dated June 10, 1999 finding that Intel Corporation "is famous for its manufacturing and sale of computer products." The Trademark Office further held that the mark INTEL, which has been used and registered for computer products, "enjoys a relatively high degree of fame among consumers as well as among the relevant public." Based upon these and other findings, the Trademark Office refused to register the trademark WINTEL (Trademark No. 1078501) in Class 9.

Country	China
---------	-------

Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Guangzhou Lianzhi Plastics and Chemistry Co., Ltd. (UNI-INTEL, App. No. 1456269)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	May 31, 1999
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	October 28, 2002
Summary of Decision	The Trademark Office of The State Administration for Industry and Commerce states, “As computers have become popular in China and they have been widely used and advertised, the Opponent’s trademark INTEL has enjoyed high fame among Chinese consumers.” Based upon this and other findings, the Trademark Office refused to register the trademark UNI-INTEL (Trademark No. 1456269) in Class 2.

Country	Colombia
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Recumbrimientos Diveros Ltda., Recudir Ltda. (INTEL, App. No. 92-331.489)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	November 6, 1990
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL for goods covered in class 9
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	April 24, 2000
Summary of Decision	The Superintendent delegated for Industrial Property issued a decision dated February 25, 1999 confirming an October 31, 1997 resolution declaring “the well-known character of the trademark INTEL in name of Intel Corporation.” The Colombian Trademark Office refused to register the INTEL trademark (Trademark No. 92.331.489) in Class 24 in Recubrimientos Diversos Limitada’s name.

Country	Costa Rica
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Computbetel S.A (BETEL and Design, App. No. 6856-97)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	September 22, 1997
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL for computers and computer products
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	January 21, 1999
Summary of Decision	The Trademark Office of Costa Rica issued a decision dated December 15, 1998 acknowledging that “the word character of INTEL is famous at international level, very well known in the field of computers and other products.” Based upon this and other findings, the Trademark Office refused to register the mark BETEL and Design (Trademark No. 6856-97) in Class 9.

Country	Costa Rica
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Unipharm Costa Rica, S.A. (UNIPENTIUM JR., App. No. 99.853)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	September 20, 1995
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	PENTIUM
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	November 30, 2000
Summary of Decision	The Third Section of the Superior Tribunal of Costa Rica issued a decision dated November 30, 2000. The Tribunal concludes that “the registered mark PENTIUM is a notorious and famous mark” and “prohibits the registration of similar terms, in any of the classes of the international classification.” The Tribunal revoked a ruling of the Industrial

	Property Registry (denying Intel's opposition) and accepted Intel's opposition, thereby denying the registration of UNIPENTIUM JR (Trademark No. 99.853) in class 5.
--	--

Country	CTM
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Intelynx Group S.A. (Intelynx, App. No. 744 581)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	April 2, 1998
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL for microprocessors and semiconductor
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	December 13, 2002
Summary of Decision	The Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market issued a decision dated December 13, 2003 finding that the INTEL mark "has acquired a reputation for microprocessor & semiconductors." The Office also held that "the 'INTELYNX' mark constitutes an unjustified exploitation of the reputation of the 'INTEL' mark, creates a suggestion and risk of association with the 'INTEL' mark and the Intel company which owns that mark, and engenders a substantial diluting effect on the 'INTEL' mark which would diminish the value of the mark." Based upon these and other findings, Intel's Opposition was upheld and the application for INTELYNX (Trademark No. 744 581) in classes 35, 36 & 42 was rejected.

Country	CTM
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Thomson Multimedia (Cinema Sound Inside, App. No. 00802348 and Digital Servo Master Inside, App. No. 00743146)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	November 13, 1990
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL INSIDE
Status of Proceeding	Appeal
Date Closed	
Summary of Decision	The CTM Trademark Office issued a decision dated December 12, 2002 finding the INTEL INSIDE mark to be highly distinctive, INSIDE is not descriptive and diluted (as argued by Thomson), and the Thomson marks are infringing. The Thomson marks were filed in class 9 for audio and electronics goods, and telecommunications

Country	Czech Republic
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Teska (INTELCOMP, Reg. No. 198159)
Proceeding	Cancellation
Application Filing Date	April 17, 1996
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL for computer technology products
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	March 24, 2000
Summary of Decision	The Czech Republic Trademark Office issued a decision dated February 24, 2000 finding that "INTEL [products] have been undoubtedly well known in the Czech Republic ... and have been widely used due to its superb quality." Based upon these and other findings, the Czech Republic Trademark Office cancelled the registration of INTELCOMP (Trademark No. 1159) in Classes 9, 37 and 42.

Country	Czech Republic
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Josef Kokes (PENTENIUM, Reg. No. 192627)
Proceeding	Cancellation

Application Filing Date	February 25, 1993
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	PENTIUM for computers and microprocessors
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	December 27, 2001
Summary of Decision	The Czech Republic Industrial Property Office issued a decision dated December 16, 1998 finding that “the consuming public and in particular professionals have become aware of it [PENTIUM] in connection with Intel’s products” and that “PENTIUM was well-known in the Czech Republic” before February 25, 1993. Based upon these and other findings, the Czech Republic Industrial Property Office cancelled the registration of PENTENIUM (Trademark No. 192 627) in Classes 9, 41 and 42.

Country	Czech Republic
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Josef Kokes v. Industrial Property Office (PENTENIUM, Reg. No. 192627)
Proceeding	Administrative Action
Application Filing Date	February 25, 1993
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	PENTIUM for computers and microprocessors
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	December 27, 2001
Summary of Decision	Josef Kokes filed an Administrative action against the Industrial Property Office of the Czech Republic following their decision in the PENTENIUM matter (Reg. No. 192627). On December 27, 2001 the High Court in Prague dismissed the administrative action filed by Mr. Kokes against the final decision of the Industrial Property Office. Again, the court recognized the famous nature of the PENTIUM mark and the upheld the cancellation of the PENTENIUM trademark.

Country	Czech Republic
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. PaENIUM s.r.o. (PaEnium, App. No. 0-129 672)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	January 30, 1998
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	PENTIUM for microprocessors
Status of Proceeding	Pending
Date Closed	
Summary of Decision	The Czech Patent Office issued a decision dated January 24, 2000 finding that PENTIUM trademarks are “notoriously known, since the most wide spread processors on the territory of the Czech Republic are concerned.” Based upon this and other findings, the Czech Patent Office rejected registration for trademark PaENTIUM in Classes 9, 37, 41 and 42.

Country	Ecuador
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Empresa Nacional De Telecomunicaciones S.A. v. Intel Corporation (INTEL WEBOUTFITTER in classes 35 and 38)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	February 9, 1999
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL in Class 9
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	March 20, 2000
Summary of Decision	Trademark Office of Ecuador issued a decision on March 13, 2000 acknowledging that “the mark INTEL is

notoriously known so its right to be protected officially is more extensive.” The decision also states that “the notoriety is a glowing proof of the economic utility of the mark, because it has been appreciated by the consuming public.” Based on this decision and other findings, the Trademark Office rejected the opposition and granted Intel’s trademark application.

Country	Ecuador
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Empresa Nacional De Telecomunicaciones S.A. v. Intel Corporation (INTEL , INTEL INSIDE , INTEL TEAMSTATION)(their marks ENTEL & ENTELCARD)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	January 16, 1998
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL in Class 9
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	January 17, 2000
Summary of Decision	The Trademark Office of Ecuador issued decisions on January 17, 2000 acknowledging that “the mark INTEL is notoriously known so its right to be protected officially is more extensive.” The decision also states that “the notoriety is a glowing proof of the economic utility of the mark, because it has been appreciated by the consuming public.” Based on this decision and other findings, the Trademark Office rejected the opposition and granted Intel’s trademark applications (Res. No. 975099 INTEL TEAMSTATION in class 9; Res. No. 975118 INTEL in class 36; Res. No. 975119 INTEL in class 9; Res. No. 975120 INTEL in class 42; Res. No. 975121 INTEL in class 38; Res. No. 975122 INTEL in class 16).

Country	France
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. SA Expert & Finance (PENTIUM , Reg. No. 93 490 857)
Proceeding	Cancellation
Application Filing Date	October 29, 1993
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	PENTIUM for computers and microprocessors
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	November 15, 1999
Summary of Decision	The Lyon Regional Court held on November 15, 1999 that the “PENTIUM trademark ... became extremely well known and notorious, due specifically to the reputation of its owner, Intel Corporation,” who is “a world leader in the data processing sector.” The Court ruled that Expert & Finance’s registration of PENTIUM in Classes 9, 35, 36 and 42 is null and void, and ordered it cancelled.

Country	France
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. INTERDISCOUNT- Buga-Rodriguez & Cauvin (PENTIUM)
Proceeding	Infringement
Application Filing Date	N/a
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	PENTIUM for processors
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	September 6, 2001
Summary of Decision	The Lower Criminal Court of Grenoble held on November 22, 1999 that PENTIUM processors “are the standards of the microcomputer industry offering a guarantee of compatibility with all other hardware and software components and had ... a reputation and renown which the competing products did not have.” The Court of Appeals confirmed on September 6, 2001 the infringement committed by the defendant, fined the defendant, and awarded Intel damages.

Country	France
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Reuter (INTEL PRESSE, Reg. No. 97 658 179)
Proceeding	Cancellation
Application Filing Date	January 3, 1997
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL for various products & services in the area of communications, including access time rental to a database server
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	September 17, 1999
Summary of Decision	The District Court of Paris held on September 17, 1999 that the “INTEL trademarks are well known to a very high proportion of the population” and “their reputation is established and recognized.” The Court ordered the change of the Intel Presse corporate name and the cancellation of the mark INTEL PRESSE (Trademark No. 97.658.179) in class 35, 38, 41 & 42 for various products and services in the area of communications, including access time rental to a data base server.

Country	France
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Preseau/Epizon (NETIUM, Reg. No. 96 645 174)
Proceeding	Cancellation
Application Filing Date	October 10, 1996
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	PENTIUM
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	April 27, 2001
Summary of Decision	Court of Appeal of Paris (France) held on April 27, 2001 that “ PENTIUM is a well known trademark” with ”undisputed reputation.” The Court revoked the registration for NETIUM.

Country	Germany
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Cornelia Gaebert and Jorg Friedrich (INDAL, Reg. No. 398 47 485)
Proceeding	Cancellation
Application Filing Date	November 11, 1999
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL for data processing devices, computer, computer hardware.
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	March 30, 2000
Summary of Decision	The German Patent and Trademark Office issued a decision dated March 30, 2000, stating that “due to the officially known market leadership [of Intel Corporation] on the microprocessor market, one must assume distinctiveness above average of [INTEL] and an extended scope of protection.” In accordance with this and other findings, the German Trademark Office cancelled registration for INDAL (Trademark No. 398 47 485) in Classes 9, 41 and 42.

Country	Germany
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Rainer Sasse (INTELSOFT, Reg. No. 398 49 435)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	Intel
Status of Proceeding	Final

Date Closed	March 1, 1999
Summary of Decision	The Register of Commerce at Kassel stated on March 1, 1999 that according to their knowledge the trademark “INTEL” is internationally protected for Intel Corporation.

Country	Germany
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Int///tel Teleservices GmbH (Corporate name INT///TEL)
Proceeding	Injunction
Application Filing Date	March 8, 1995
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL and Intel Corporation Tradename
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	March 30, 2000
Summary of Decision	The Regional Court of Hamburg issued a decision dated March 30, 2000 stating that Intel “enjoys a high degree of fame in computer sector which has a considerable effect on the area of protection of the [INTEL] trade mark and on the [Intel] corporate name.” The Court decision was to uphold the interim injunction issued by the Court on March 5, 1996, which prohibited use of INT///TEL as part of a corporate name for telephone marketing services.

Country	Germany
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. WeberHaus GmbH & Co. KG (INTELLIGENCE INSIDE/picture/oval, Reg. No. 397 02 310; INTELLIGENCE INSIDE/picture/oval WeberHaus, Reg. No. 397 02 311; INTEL INSIDE, Reg. No. 397 02 322)
Proceeding	Infringement
Application Filing Date	May 9, 1997; February 21, 1997; May 9, 1997
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL INSIDE
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	December 18, 2002
Summary of Decision	The Mannheim Landgericht County Court issued a judgment dated September 21, 2001 forbidding defendant from using Intelligence Inside and requiring defendant to bear all costs. The Court acknowledged the protection of the well-known mark against exploitation of its reputation, and “a high degree of familiarity of the trademark” within the territory of the European Community.

Country	Greece
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Evrognosi Anonimi Ekpaideftiki Ependetiki Emporiki Diafmistiki Etairia Parohis Ypiresion (INBUSINESS/stylized, App. No. 140303/15-6-1999)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	June 6, 1999
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL, INTEL INSIDE, INTEL NETSTRUCTURE for computers, telecommunication and communication equipment
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	February 23, 2001
Summary of Decision	The Greek Trademark Administrative Committee issued a decision dated February 23, 2001 acknowledging that Intel Corporation “is one of the largest and internationally well known enterprises” and that the trademark INTEL, INTEL INSIDE, and INTEL NETSTRUCTURE “are trademarks of reputation, and thus their protection spreads also to dissimilar products.” The court held that the applicant’s trademark represents “an imitation” of Intel’s INTEL INBUSINESS trademark. Based upon these and other findings, the Greek Trademark Administrative Committee

rejected the trademark INBUSINESS (stylized) (Trademark No.140303/15-6-1999) for registration in classes 9, 16, 35 and 41.

Country	Greece
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Agroticos Oikos Spyrou Spyr. AEBE (PENTIUM, App. No. 135213/23-5-1997)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	May 23, 1997
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	PENTIUM for computer and microprocessors
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	September 6, 1999
Summary of Decision	The Greek Trademark Committee issued a decision dated September 6, 1999 acknowledging that Intel Corporation “is one of the biggest and known world over companies” and that the “trademark PENTIUM for computer ... enjoys a special fame and uniqueness and gets the biggest market share for computers in Greece and other countries of the world.” Based upon these and other findings, the Greece Trademark Committee rejected the PENTIUM trademark (Trademark No. 135213/23-5-97) for registration in class 31.

Country	India
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Intel Tools & Diesets Private Ltd. (INTELTOOLS being used as a trade name)
Proceeding	Lawsuit/ Permanent Injunction Proceeding
Application Filing Date	
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	Intel Corporation as a trade name
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	August 8, 2002
Summary of Decision	The High Court of Judicature at Madras on August 8, 2002 stated that Intel’s “trade name is widely known in the business circle since 1968” and considering the overwhelming documentary evidence filed by Intel, “it is clear that the applicant’s trade name is popular throughout the world.” Based on these and other findings, the High Court made the previously granted interim injunction absolute.

Country	Japan
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Mitsubishi Rayon Co., Ltd. (INTEL and Katakana, Reg. No. 4091440)
Proceeding	Cancellation
Application Filing Date	July 12, 1996
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL and INTEL (Katakana characters) for goods relating to business of Intel Corporation
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	December 21, 1998
Summary of Decision	The Japanese Board of Trials held on December 18, 1998 that INTEL and its Katakana characters had “already become famous not only in foreign countries but also in Japan before the filing date of Trademark [Mitsubishi Rayon’s INTEL and Katakana mark].” Based upon this and other findings, the Japanese Court ruled that registration for the trademark INTEL and its Katakana characters (Trademark No. 4091440) in Class 23 be cancelled.

Country	Japan
---------	-------

Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Calsonic Kansei K.K. (INTELBEE in National Class 12, Reg. No. 4015851)
Proceeding	Cancellation
Application Filing Date	February 7, 1990
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL, INTEL (in Katakana characters), and INTEL (dropped e logo) for computer-related products
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	July 17, 2001
Summary of Decision	The Japanese Board of Trials, on July 17, 2001, started off by saying that the marks INTEL, INTEL (in Katakana characters) and INTEL Logo (dropped “e”) “are famous worldwide through the complainant’s use with its microchips, such as microprocessors, microcontrollers, etc.” Furthermore, Intel “has been using [INTEL] as its house mark and had acquired fame not only in Japan but also on a global scale before the filing date” of INTELBEE. The Board then said that “because the range of the traders and/or consumers for the complainant’s products... overlaps with the range of traders and/or consumers for ‘transportation equipment’ sold as products, the cited marks [Intel’s marks] are considered to have become famous among traders and/or consumers also for the Subject Goods [transportation equipment] before the filing date of the Subject Mark [INTELBEE].” The Board concluded that INTEL, INTEL (in Katakana characters) and INTEL Logo (dropped “e”) “had been well known and/or famous... among traders and/or consumers in the field of the designated goods under the Subject Mark [INTELBEE]” and that it is likely that goods branded INTELBEE will be confused with goods connected with Intel’s business. Based on Intel’s fame, the likelihood of confusion and principals of dilution, the Japanese Board of Trials ruled that registration for the trademark INTELBEE (Trademark No. 4015851) in National Class 12 be cancelled.

Country	Japan
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Seiko-Epson K.K. (INTELLIDGE, Reg. No. 4340433)
Proceeding	Cancellation
Application Filing Date	March 11, 1999
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL and INTEL (dropped e logo) for computer-related products including microprocessors
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	March 15, 2001
Summary of Decision	The Board of Trial Judges held on March 15, 2001 that the INTEL and INTEL Logo (dropped “e”) marks had “become well known and/or famous as marks in use with computer related products, including microprocessors” in many countries around the world, including Japan, by the time the INTELLIDGE mark was filed for registration. Based upon this and other findings, the Board of Trial Judges ruled that registration for the trademark INTELLIDGE (Trademark No. 4340433) be cancelled for classes 2, 9, and 18.

Country	Korea (South)
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. EntelSystem Co., Ltd. (ENTEL and Design, Reg. No. 64604)
Proceeding	Cancellation
Application Filing Date	October 5, 1999
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL and INTEL (dropped e logo) for computer-related products
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	July 25, 2002
Summary of Decision	The Decision of the Fourth Bureau of the Korean Intellectual Property Tribunal on July 25, 2002 concluded that the INTEL and INTEL Logo (dropped “e”) marks “have already become well-known and famous among the domestic and foreign consumers at the time of filing date of the subject mark [ENTEL and Design].” The Tribunal therefore ordered the invalidation of the ENTEL and Design mark (Service mark No. 64604) in class 42 and ENTEL SYSTEM

mark (Service mark No. 64605) in class 42.
--

Country	Korea (South)
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Intelis Co., Ltd (INTELIS, App. No. 94-35742)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	September 5, 1994
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	Intel Corporation (trade name), INTEL, INTEL (dropped e logo), and INTEL INSIDE logo for computer related goods (KIPO also mentions in its decision that PENTIUM has become well known for microprocessors)
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	May 31, 1997
Summary of Decision	The Korean Industrial Property Office issued a decision dated May 31, 1997 acknowledging that “Intel Corporation is one of the largest corporations in the world, and the leading company in the field of microprocessors” and that “by developing superior products in their industry and then marketing their products ... the Intel trade name and their trademarks INTEL, INTEL Logo (dropped “e”), and INTEL INSIDE (logo) became famous worldwide and synonymous with the highest level of quality.” The KIPO went on to say that “as Korea has become a leading nation in the use of personal computers, the fame and reputation of the INTEL trademarks has spread from computer users, manufacturers, and retailers to the general public.” The KIPO finally concluded that “the INTELIS trademark should not be registered because its great similarity to the famous mark INTEL, when used on computer-related goods, will disturb the public order and confuse consumers as to the entity which is producing the goods bearing the mark.” The KIPO therefore entered a final rejection for trademark application No. 94-35742 for INTELIS in Class 39.

Country	Korea (South)
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Hansem Co., Ltd. (HANSEM INTEL in Korean characters, Reg. No. 374886)
Proceeding	Cancellation
Application Filing Date	July 26, 1994
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL, INTEL (dropped e logo), and INTEL INSIDE for microprocessors, computers and computer-related products
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	February 11, 1999
Summary of Decision	The Korean Industrial Property Tribunal held on February 8, 1999 that Intel Corporation is the owner of INTEL, INTEL Logo (dropped “e”), and INTEL INSIDE (collectively referred to as the “cited marks”) which are “well known world wide to traders or consumers in computer communities.” The Korean Industrial Property Tribunal ordered the invalidation of the HANSEN INTEL registration (Trademark No. 374886) in Class 26, not because it considered there to be a likelihood of confusion, but because “the subject mark was filed for registration with a view to free-ride on the incorporeal proprietary values of the cited marks.” Based upon this and other findings, the Korean Industrial Property Tribunal held that the registration for HANSEM INTEL disturbed public order or public morals.

Country	Korea (South)
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Sae Woo Polymer Co., Ltd. (INTELL in Korean characters, App. No. 96-41974)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	July 26, 1994
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL, INTEL (stylized), and INTEL INSIDE
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	January 20, 1999
Summary of Decision	The Korean Industrial Property Office issued a decision on January 20, 1999 acknowledging “that the cited marks are known to domestic consumers” as Intel Corporation’s marks. Based on this and other findings, the Korean Industrial Property Office refused to register the trademark INTELL in Korean characters in Class 26.

Country	Korea (South)
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Sae Woo Polymer Co., Ltd. (INTELL, App. No. 96-41975)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	July 26, 1994
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL, INTEL (stylized), and INTEL INSIDE
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	January 20, 1999
Summary of Decision	The Korean Industrial Property Office issued a decision on January 20, 1999 acknowledging “that the cited marks are known to domestic consumers” as Intel Corporation’s marks. Based on this and other findings, the Korean Industrial Property Office refused to register the trademark INTELL in Class 26.

Country	Korea (South)
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Han Nong Co., Ltd. (PENTIUM in Korean characters, App. No. 96-46293)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	October 17, 1996
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	PENTIUM
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	November 30, 1998
Summary of Decision	The Korean Industrial Property Office issued a decision on November 30, 1998 acknowledging that Intel’s marks “are considerably well known among domestic consumers” and that the proprietor of the subject trademark application attempts to “free-ride on the fame and trust of” Intel Corporation’s marks. Based on these and other findings, the Korean Industrial Property Office refused to register the trademark PENTIUM (Trademark No. 9646293) in Korean characters in Class 10.

Country	Korea (South)
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Dong-A Pencils Co., Ltd. (PENTIUM in Korean characters, App. No. 96-2060)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	January 16, 1996
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	PENTIUM for computers and microprocessors
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	August 31, 1998
Summary of Decision	The Korean Industrial Property Office issued a decision on August 31, 1998 acknowledging that “the cited [PENTIUM] marks are internationally well-known trademarks for computers and microprocessors” and that they are “well-known in Korea” as well. Based on these and other findings, the Korean Industrial Property Office refused to register the trademark PENTIUM in Korean characters (Trademark No. 962060) in Class 22.

Country	Korea (South)
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Seoul Heinz Co., Ltd. (PENTIUM, App. No 40-1997-0023148)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	May 22, 1997
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	PENTIUM for microprocessors
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	June 28, 1999
Summary of Decision	The Korean Intellectual Property Office issued a decision on June 28, 1999 acknowledging that “the cited [PENTIUM] mark is widely known in Korea” and that the proprietor of the subject trademark application attempts to “free-ride the notability” of Intel Corporation’s mark. Based on this and other findings, the Korean Industrial Property Office refused to register the trademark PENTIUM (Trademark No. 40-1997-0023148) in Class 7.

Country	Korea (South)
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Intelcom Co., Ltd. (trade name INTELCOM)
Proceeding	Injunction
Company established	August 22, 1990
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL and INTEL (Korean letters)
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	September 20, 2001
Summary of Decision	The Seoul District Court issued a decision on September 20, 2001 acknowledging that INTEL and/or INTEL (in Korean letters) as being short for Intel Corporation “is widely known in Korea” and that the term INTEL, according to the English-Korean dictionary, “is famous in the field of computers involving microprocessors and semiconductor chips.” Based on this and other findings, the Seoul District Court granted the preliminary injunction against use of the trade name INTELCOM.

Country	Korea (South)
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. EntelSystem Co., Ltd. (ENTEL and Design, App. No. 0014809(1999))
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	October 5, 1999
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL for computer-related services
Status of Proceeding	Sustained and Final

Date Closed	August 2, 2001
Summary of Decision	The Korean Intellectual Property Office issued a decision on August 2, 2001 acknowledging a previous finding from the Patent Court that the “INTEL marks are famous around the world and in Korea.” Based on this and other findings, the Korean Intellectual Property Office sustained the opposition raised by Intel Corporation against EntelSystem’s class 35 applications (Trademark Nos. 14809 and 14810 (1999)).

Country	National Arbitration Forum (Korea)
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Gu Ja Bong (FA0204000112465)(Pentium.biz)
Proceeding	Domain Name Dispute
Application Filing Date	Complaint filed: April 26, 2002
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	PENTIUM
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	July 3, 2002
Summary of Decision	The NAP decision acknowledged that “Intel created the PENTIUM world and corresponding significance in its mark.” The decision also states that Intel’s “PENTIUM family of marks represents internationally recognized symbols of computer processor technology.” Based upon this and other findings, the NAF ordered that the domain be transferred to Intel.

Country	National Arbitration Forum (Korea)
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Tong Yang Life Insurance Co (FA0204000110788)(intel.biz)
Proceeding	Domain Name Dispute
Application Filing Date	Complaint filed: April 23, 2002
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	June 25, 2002
Summary of Decision	The NAF decision found that Intel and its mark are well known worldwide. Based upon this and other findings, the NAF held that registrant was on notice of Intel’s rights in the INTEL mark due to the “fame of the INTEL mark” and ordered that the domain be transferred to Intel.

Country	Peru
Parties (Disputed Mark)	INTELICORP SAC and design
Proceeding	In the Transitory Civil Chamber of the Supreme Court of Peru -- Administrative Contentious Procedure No. 392-2001, dated August 14, 2003. Intel Corporation vs. the Tribunal of Defense of Competition and Intellectual Property INDECOPI; and Intelicorp Consultores y Asociados SAC (appeal of opposition loss)
Application Filing Date	October 3, 1999
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL® mark. Notoriety recognized <i>without any limitation</i> regarding the scope of protection.
Status of Proceeding	In second appeal review period.
Date Closed	Still open matter pending new appeal by other parties
Summary of Decision	Intel appealed to the Peru Supreme Court to overturn an INDECOPI resolution that had rejected Intel’s opposition against Intelicorp’s application for the mark INTELICORP SAC & Design in Class 42 for computer science related services. Intel based the opposition on various INTEL formative trademarks in Peru, and on the notoriety of the trademark INTEL. The Peru Supreme Court declared NULL AND VOID the underlying decision of Indecopi; explicitly recognized the notoriety of Intel Corporation’s trademark INTEL; and gave the trademark INTEL

	recognition according to Article 486 of the Andean Pact. This decision recognized the notoriety of the INTEL mark regardless of goods and services.
--	---

Country	Poland
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Intelpark Spolka z.o.o. (INTELCARD, Reg. No 114489)
Proceeding	Cancellation
Application Filing Date	April 1995
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	March 29, 2001
Summary of Decision	The Patent Office of the Republic of Poland held on March 29, 2001 that Intel Corporation is “unquestionably a well known in the world and in Poland producer of microprocessors and accessories for teleinformatics.” The Office also found that Intel was granted a status of “generally recognized trademark associated with the wide-understood field of information technology.” Based upon these and other findings, the Polish Trademark Office cancelled registration for trademark INTELCARD (Trademark No. 114489) in class 42.

Country	Poland
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Intelpark Spolka z.o.o. (INTELMED, Reg. No 114490)
Proceeding	Cancellation
Application Filing Date	April 1995
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	April 2, 2001
Summary of Decision	The Patent Office of the Republic of Poland held on April 2, 2001 that Intel Corporation is “unquestionably a well known in the world and in Poland producer of microprocessors and accessories for teleinformatics.” The Office also found that Intel was granted a status of “generally recognized trademark associated with the wide-understood field of information technology.” Based upon these and other findings, the Polish Trademark Office cancelled registration for trademark INTELMED (Trademark No. 144490) in class 42.

Country	Poland
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Intelpark Spolka z.o.o. (INTELPARK, Reg. No 109839)
Proceeding	Cancellation
Application Filing Date	April 1995
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	March 29, 2001
Summary of Decision	The Patent Office of the Republic of Poland held on April 2, 2001 that Intel Corporation is “unquestionably a well known in the world and in Poland producer of microprocessors and accessories for teleinformatics.” [sic] The Office also found that Intel was granted a status of “generally recognized trademark associated with the wide-understood field of information technology.” Based upon these and other findings, the Polish Trademark Office cancelled registration for trademark INTELPARK (Trademark No. 109839) in class 9.

Country	Poland
---------	--------

Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Intelpark Spolka z.o.o. (INTELPARK, Tradename)
Proceeding	Lawsuit
Application Filing Date	
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	September 10, 2002
Summary of Decision	The Regional Court in Bielsko-Biala, V Commercial Department held on September 10, 2002 that “the processors produced by Intel enjoy a definite renown on the global market and develops computer software, primarily in the area of operating systems and users software.” The Court also held that “the Intel trademark is commonly known throughout the world,” “it has an enormous market value and is included among the most widely known and most valuable commercial trademarks, such as Coca Cola and Microsoft” and “the exceptional position of Intel on the global computer market is also confirmed in Poland.” Based upon these and other findings, the Court prohibited use of INTELPARK as a company name.

Country	Portugal
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Forintel-Formacao Informatica e Servicos Lda. (FOR IN TEL, App. No. 266980)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	August 21, 1990
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL in Class 9
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	January 5, 1998
Summary of Decision	The Portuguese Trademark Office issued a decision on January 5, 1998 acknowledging that the mark INTEL and Intel Corporation “itself are well-known.” Based on this and other findings, the Portuguese Trademark Office refused to register the trademark FOR IN TEL (Trademark No. 266980) in Class 9.

Country	Spain
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Antel Sistemas (Antel Sistemas, App. No. 2,424,908)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	January 4, 2002
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL for computers
Status of Proceeding	Final (NOTE: This company’s trade name application was granted by the Spanish PTO, Intel has appealed.)
Date Closed	
Summary of Decision	The Spanish Patent and Trademark Office issued a final decision on June 5, 2002, to refuse registration of this mark based on the similarity to our mark and “the great notoriety and recognition among the companies of the sector.” Based on this and other findings, the Spanish PTO refused to register ANTEL SISTEMAS in class 9 for electric and electronic apparatus and instruments, electric and electronic control apparatus.

Country	Spain
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Intelsis Sistemas Inteligentes, S.A. (INTELSIS, App. No. 1,714,839)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	July 28, 1992
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL for microprocessors
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	May 20, 1999
Summary of Decision	The Spanish Superior Court of Madrid held on May 20, 1999 that the mark INTEL “is well known in the marketplace, that it already has made a name for itself.” Based on this and other findings, the Superior Court of Madrid ordered the Trademark Office to refuse access to the Industrial Property Register to the trademark INTELSIS (Trademark No. 1.714.893) in class 9 for scientific, nautical, geodesic, electrical, photographic instruments, among others.

Country	Spain
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Danirex International S.L. (Look Inside, App. No. 2307688)
Proceeding	Final
Application Filing Date	November 27, 2002
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL INSIDE in the IT sector
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	July 21, 2003
Summary of Decision	The Spanish Patent & Trademark Office Board of Appeal held that INTEL INSIDE is “a renowned trademark in the IT sector [and] requires greater protection against those trademarks which are very similar. In granting its decision rejecting the mark LOOK INSIDE, for retail services, the Board determined that given the structure of the opposed mark where the word inside appears, it inevitably evokes the INTEL INSIDE mark which is a renowned mark. Based on this and other findings, the Board held that LOOK INSIDE is incompatible as there is a clear risk of undue association.

Country	Spain
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Fundacion Dintel para la Difusion de las Ingenierias Informatica y de Telecomunicacion (dINTEL (Device), App. No. 2.211.105)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	February 1, 1999
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL for computers and telecommunications
Status of Proceeding	Pending (Appeal filed by Applicant)
Date Closed	N/a
Summary of Decision	The Spanish Trademark Office issued a decision on February 7, 2000 acknowledging that the mark INTEL “is well known ... in the fields of telecommunications and computers.” Based on this and other findings, the Spanish Court of Trademark rejected the trademark dINTEL in Class 42 for Engineering or professional services requiring a university formation. Services for investigations, projects, appraisals, estimates or reports. Services rendered by organizations to its own members..

Country	Spain
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Vasal SA (MACINTEL, Reg. No 2.131.114)
Proceeding	Lawsuit
Application Filing Date	May 19, 1998
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL for computers and telecommunications
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	November 13, 2002
Summary of Decision	The Court of First Instance No. 5 issued a decision on November 13, 2002 acknowledging the “notorious and renowned INTEL trademark.” The court held that Intel Corporation has exclusive right over its commercial name INTEL within the computers and telecommunications sector, as well as over the INTEL and INTEL INSIDE trademarks for “protecting and distinguishing products under class 9” and related products. Based on this & other findings, the Court rejected the registration and/or use of the trademark MACINTEL (Trademark No. 2.131.114 in class 9).

Country	Spain
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Intelnet, S.A. Zargoza (INTELNET, App. No. 1.988.238 and trade name INTELNET S.A., App. No. 205647)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	October 3, 1995
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL, INTEL INSIDE, PENTIUM for microprocessors and integrated circuits
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	June 1, 2000
Summary of Decision	The Spanish Court held on June 1, 2000 that Intel Corporation “is a world leader electronic company in manufacturing of integrated circuits and micro processors and its trademarks ‘INTEL INSIDE’, ‘PENTIUM’, etc. are well known by the consumers.” Based on these and other findings, the Spanish Court enjoined defendant’s use of INTELNET as a trade name (Trade name No. 205647) for use by an electronic company that manufactures communication components and equipment and as a trademark (Trademark No. 1.988.238) in class 9.

Country	Spain
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Hilados y Tejidos Malagueños S.A. (INTEL App. Nos. 1.801.732 and 1.801.733)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	February 3, 1994
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	March 31, 2001
Summary of Decision	The Court of Granada held on April 16, 2001 that Intel’s mark is “well-known in ... country” and that Intel has the exclusive right to use its commercial name INTEL and the right to exclude third parties from using it. Based on these and other findings, the Court declared the defendant’s trademark INTEL null and void.

Country	Spain
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Inatalaciones de Telecomunicaciones SL (INTELCO App. Nos. 1.900.159; 1.900.160 and 1.900.161)
Proceeding	Opposition

Application Filing Date	June 28, 1994
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL, INTEL INSIDE, PENTIUM, etc.
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	June 28, 2001
Summary of Decision	The Court of First Instance No. 7 held on June 28, 2001 that the INTEL mark has “gone beyond the concept of a notorious trademark itself, becoming what is called ‘renowned trademark.’” The Court also stated that Intel has “worldwide prestige in the computer field” and that “the trademarks INTEL INSIDE, PENTIUM, etc., are well known today by any person using personal computers.” Based on these and other findings, the Court declared the defendant’s trade name and marks INTELCO (1900159 for class 35, 1900160 for class 37 and 1900161 for class 39) null and void.

Country	Spain
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Cefa Toys S.A. (Quique Pentium App. No. 2.135.038)
Proceeding	Lawsuit
Application Filing Date	March 1, 1998
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	PENTIUM
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	November 13, 2000
Summary of Decision	The Court of First Instance No. 4 held that it cannot be denied and any person with limited knowledge on software and computers knows, that the PENTIUM processor is the majority processor implanted in personal computers, being one of the points that indicate the quality of the product. Defendant was ordered to cease any use of the PENTIUM denomination for distinguishing its products, and by any other means including its advertising in the Internet or any other communication media; as well as to cease in the manufacture, distribution, offer and sale of products distinguished with the mentioned denomination (Trademark No. 2.135.038).

Country	Spain
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Marina Adela Munoz Quesada (PENTIUM Reg. No. 1.968.235)
Proceeding	Contentious – Administrative Appeal (#2139/1997)
Application Filing Date	September 20, 1998
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	PENTIUM
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	January 22, 2002
Summary of Decision	The Superior Court of Justice found PENTIUM notoriously known by most of the “medium consumers.” The Court stated that the PENTIUM mark has a prestige and an excellent reputation for the quality and services of the products it covers, which exceeds the narrow circle of the consumers specialized in the computer and telecommunication sector. The Court itself recognized the notoriousness of the PENTIUM mark and felt it not necessary to read the numerous publications that were submitted as evidence. Based on this and other findings, the court found that the use of the “PENTIUM word objectively implies the intention of the co-defendant of using the prestige of the denomination at issue, and this use, even in products which are very different, is not allowed by Law.” (Trademark No. 1.968.235).

Country	Spain
---------	-------

Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Inside and Technology S.A. (I INSIDE/stylized App. No. 2 177 22518)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	June 28, 1994
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL INSIDE
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	May 10, 2000
Summary of Decision	The Spanish Patent and Trademark Office Board of Appeal held on June 28, 2001 that “the mark INTEL INSIDE is very well-known in the computer sector” and deserves greater protection with respect to those marks which are very similar to it ...” Based on these findings, the Spanish Patent and Trademark Office Board of Appeal refused the appeal of the Trademark Office’s decision to refuse registration of I INSIDE (Trademark No. 2.177.225/8) in Class 39.

Country	Spain
Parties (Disputed Marks)	Intel v. Jose Manuel Lopez Gil (Desintel #2509218/9)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	October 22, 2002
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL and INTEL INSIDE / data processing equipment and computers
Status of Proceeding	Pending
Date Closed	
Summary of Decision	The Ministry of Science And Technology stated “taking into account that the contested application contains the term INTEL and that it applies to data processing equipment and computers, we admit the opposition in light of the opponents arguments based on the reputation and well-known character of their INTEL and INTEL INSIDE trademarks in the field of computers, we consider these marks to be incompatible and they may generate a risk of confusion/association on the market and a situation of unfair benefiting from the well-known character of said registrations.”

Country	Switzerland
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Martignoni Electronics AG (INTELICOM, App. No. 432 333)
Proceeding	Cancellation
Application Filing Date	July 18, 1995
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL & Pentium in the computing fields
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	June 3, 1999
Summary of Decision	The Federal Institute of Intellectual Property issued a decision on June 3, 1999 acknowledging “the notoriety of the mark INTEL (Intel Pentium) in the computing field”. Based on these findings, the Federal Institute cancelled the mark INTELICOM in Class 9 (Trademark No. 432333).

Country	Switzerland
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Intelia Societe Anonyme (INTELIA, IR. No. 713 951)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	May 25, 1999
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL in the computing fields
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	October 4, 2001
Summary of Decision	The Federal Institute of Intellectual Property issued a decision on October 4, 2001 acknowledging that the INTEL marks “are very well-known in the computer field”. Based on these and other findings, the Federal Institute of Intellectual Property will refuse protection of the International Registration for INTELIA (Trademark No. 713951) in Switzerland in class 9 and class 42.

Country	Taiwan
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Guangmei Clock and Optical Company (ALL INTELL, App. No. 00869459)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	June 23, 1998
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL and 英代爾 (YING DAI ER)
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	August 2, 2001
Summary of Decision	The Taiwan Intellectual Property Office issued a decision finding that the INTEL and 英代爾 (YING DAI ER) marks are “widely recognized among relevant enterprises and consumers and had achieved a definite level of fame prior to the trademark application the opposed filed on 23 June 1998.” Based on this, the Taiwan Intellectual Property Office revoked approval of the trademark ALL INTELL in Class 9 (Trademark No. 00869459).

Country	Taiwan
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Wu Ssu-Chung (WINTEL, App. No. 88014090, Reg No. 00894218)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	March 31, 1999
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL for computer chips, computers and computer-related products
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	January 30, 2002
Summary of Decision	The Taiwan Intellectual Property Office issued decision on August 2, 2001 finding that the INTEL and widely recognized among relevant industries and consumers and other findings, the Ministry of Economic Affairs revoked approval of the WINTEL mark in Class 9 (Trademark No. 00894218).

Country	Thailand
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. ICC International Public Company (INTEL and DESIGN, App. No. 319522 , Class 18)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL
Status of Proceeding	Final

Date Closed	February 19, 2003 (FC confirms that Sept. 1999 decision rejects application and that ICC did not appeal.)
Summary of Decision	The Trademark Registrar found that Intel Corporation has used the INTEL mark “to the extent that such word became well-known.” The Registrar concluded that the filing of the application was “aimed to take advantage of the reputation and well-knownness of [Intel’s] trademark that may lead to the public confusion as to the ownership or source of goods.” The Registrar therefore refused to register I.C.C.’s trademark applications for INTEL and Design in Class 18 (Trademark No. 319522) and INTEL and Design in Class 25 (Trademark No. 319523).

Country	Thailand
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. ICC International Public Company (INTEL and DESIGN, App. No. 319523 , Class 25)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	February 19, 2003 (FC confirms that Sept. 1999 decision rejects application and that ICC did not appeal.)
Summary of Decision	Trademark Registrar of Garuda states that we use the Intel mark as part of our name and “have been using it to the extent that such word became well-known.” Registrar concluded that the filing of the application was “aimed to take advantage of the reputation and well-knownness of the opponent’s trademark that may lead to the public confusion as to the ownership or source of goods.” The Registrar therefore refused to register the trademark INTEL and Design in Class 25.

Country	UK
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Digitall Inc. (DIGITALL INSIDE, App. No. 2229067)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	April 12, 2000
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL INSIDE
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	March 26, 2003
Summary of Decision	<p>The UK Trademark Office issued a decision dated February 20, 2003 finding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The INTEL INSIDE was undisputedly famous and such fame was not limited to microprocessors. 2. The common use of INSIDE + the common pattern = Similar Marks because: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Consumers view marks in their entirety/as a whole, and do not analyze the various elements/details; b. Similarity in the pattern of the marks in that both were in the “{name}INSIDE” format which is ungrammatical and unique; c. Status of the trademark register irrelevant – it is the marketplace that counts, and d. Digitall is descriptive. 3. Due to the fame of the INTEL INSIDE mark, its unique and ungrammatical pattern, Defendant no doubt had knowledge of it. Thus, regardless of intent or motive, there could be no due cause in adopting the mark and it had other options. 4. Given the fame of Intel with respect to arcade/video games with which the defendant’s coin apparatus would be used, and the post purchase reinforcement of seeing the Intel Inside logo on the computer system every time it is used, there would be a connection of Digitall Inside to Intel Inside sufficient for an undue advantage and a “boon” in sales to Digitall as a result.

Country	UK
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Kirpal Singh Sihra, (Intel-Play, Case No. CH/2002/APP/0568 .)
Proceeding	Cancellation
Application Filing Date	April 10, 2001
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	January 24, 2003
Summary of Decision	The High Court of Justice (Chancery Division) refused registration of the INTEL-PLAY mark for toys because use of such mark would take unfair advantage of and be detrimental to the distinctive character and reputation of Intel Corporation's INTEL mark. This win came on appeal after Intel Corporation had lost an opposition filed with the Trademark Office Hearing Officer. The High Court of Justice held that the INTEL mark is so well-known and enjoys such high repute in the UK, that the defendant's use of the INTEL PLAY mark would "almost certainly reduce the distinctive character of [the INTEL mark], founded as it is on high-quality, technologically-based products with a national and international reputation." The Court essentially held in Intel's favor on a dilution theory, not a confusion theory, stating that "The use of the INTEL-PLAY mark will almost inevitably dilute the strength of the INTEL mark. The connection made in the minds of the public between the INTEL-PLAY mark, used on what the Hearing Officer describes as unsophisticated goods, and the existing INTEL mark will, in my judgment, almost certainly reduce the distinctive character of the latter..." The Court further stated that "INTEL is an invented word and is not a generally recognized abbreviation for another word such as 'intellect' or intelligent."

Country	UK
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. British Telecommunications (INTELLACT, App. No. 2267048)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	April 10, 2001
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL for computer related goods and services
Status of Proceeding	Closed
Date Closed	June 26, 2003
Summary of Decision	The UK Trademark Office issued a decision acknowledging that both parties agreed that the case effectively depended on whether INTEL and INTELLACT are similar since applicant conceded the remaining elements. The Office found that "INTEL is an invented word...I can see nothing which indicates that it is anything other than a highly distinctive trade mark." The Office also found that "In INTELLACT the distinctive and dominant component of the trade mark is, in my view, the INTEL element, owing to the enormous reputation of INTEL for computer related goods and services. I note the extra L and I note the ACT element, however, INTEL is such a famous mark that the INTEL element jumps out and grabs the attention." Based upon these and other findings, BT's application for INTELLACT (Trademark No. 2267048) in Classes 9, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41 and 42 was refused.

Country	United States
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Bose Corporation v. QSC Audio Products, Inc.
Proceeding	Opposition (Appeals for the Federal Circuit)
Application Filing Date	N/A
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL & PENTIUM
Status of Proceeding	Final

Date Closed	
Summary of Decision	U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit used both the Pentium mark and the Intel mark as examples of famous marks.

Country	The United States of America
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Felicia Wheeler-Sweet (INTELMETRIC INCORPORATED, App. No. 74/427,409)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	August 20, 1993
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL for computer-related products
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	July 27, 2000
Summary of Decision	Trademark Trial and Appeal Board held on May 18, 1999, that Intel Corporation “has established the fame of its marks for computer products” and that “INTEL and INTEL INSIDE marks for its various computer-related goods are famous.” Based on these and other findings, the TTAB refused registration of INTELMETRIC CORPORATION in Class 42.

Country	Uruguay
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Mario C. Macri (PENTIUM, App. No. 2.79814)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	July 28, 1995
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	PENTIUM in Class 9
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	June 3, 1999
Summary of Decision	On December 9, 1998 the Department rejected registration of PENTIUM in Class 25 (Trademark No. 279814) based upon Intel’s “notorious mark.”

Country	Venezuela
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Integracion Electronica y Sistemas C.A. de C.V. (INTELECSIS, App. No. 10077/91)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	May 30, 1991
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	May 23, 1996
Summary of Decision	The Ministry of Trade Intellectual Property Service Office rejects Integracion’s trademark application stating the Office “has found that the applied trademark [Intelecsis] does reproduce the notorious trademark [INTEL] which is the bases of this opposition” and “The qualification as notorious granted to a trademark should be related to the general knowledge which the consumer public may have of such trademark.” (Intelecsis, Trademark No. 91-10077 in class 26)

Country	Venezuela
Parties (Disputed Mark)	Intel Corporation v. Carlos Alberto Lizarralde Vilche (INTEL FINANCE, App. No. 92-13532)
Proceeding	Opposition
Application Filing Date	June 30, 1992
Mark Found Famous/Covered Goods	INTEL for computers
Status of Proceeding	Final
Date Closed	July 27, 1996
Summary of Decision	The Ministry of Development of Venezuela issued a decision on July 12, 1996 that trademark INTEL is “notoriously known in different countries.” Based on this and other findings, the Ministry of Development denied registration of the mark INTEL FINANCE in local class 38 (Trademark No. 92-13532).